

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/540,524

Applicant(s)
Jose Tamez-Pena et al.,

Examiner
Tiffany A. Fetzner

Art Unit
2862



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner

(3) Inventor Dr. Kevin J. Parker

(2) Attorney David J. Edmondson Reg. No. 35,126

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 16, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, and 12

Identification of prior art discussed:

Freundlich et al.,

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A telephone interview was conducted with the examiner on July 2nd 2002 with applicant's attorney, which addressed the issues from the March 28th 2002 office action. Applicant proposed a possible draft amendment to the claims, and a telephone interview with one of the inventors and the examiner. The proposed draft was received by the examiner and the interview was held on July 16th 2002, the inventor present was Dr. Parker. in the telephone interview with: the examiner, the inventor Dr. Parker, and the applicant's representative, it was acknowledged by all parties present that Figures 1 through 4, of the Freundlich et al., reference did currently suggest, and/or show the independent claims as originally filed because the distinguishing features of applicant's invention, from the disclosed specification were not a clear feature of the independent claims as filed. Applicant expressed a desire to rectify this issue, and the examiner agreed to consider any supplemental amendment filed. Agreement to the claims was not reached because the proposed claims were "draft" only.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Tiffany Fetzner
AU 2862 703-305-0430

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required